

## **San Jacinto River Waste Pits Superfund Site Communications Plan**

### **Action Summary (Internal Only)**

EPA is issuing the Proposed Plan for cleaning up the San Jacinto River Waste Pits to solicit public comment on the remedial alternatives as part of EPA's public participation responsibilities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA or Superfund). The proposed Preferred Remedy is Alternative 6N (Full Removal of Materials Exceeding Cleanup Levels, Institutional Controls, and Monitored Natural Recovery) for the northern impoundments and aquatic area, and Alternative 4S (Removal and Offsite Disposal) for the southern impoundment.

EPA will select a final remedy for the Site after the public comment period has ended and the comments have been reviewed and carefully considered. EPA may select a different alternative or a modified version of the Preferred Remedy based on new information or public comments.

The Site, located in Harris County, Texas, consists of a set of impoundments built in the mid-1960s for the disposal of solid and liquid pulp and paper mill wastes, and the surrounding areas containing sediments and soils impacted by waste materials disposed in the impoundments. The northern set of impoundments, approximately 14 acres in size, are located on the western bank of the San Jacinto River, north of the Interstate-10 Bridge over the San Jacinto River. These northern impoundments are partially submerged in the river. The southern impoundment, less than 20 acres in size, is located on a small peninsula that extends south of I-10. The wastes that were deposited in the impoundments are contaminated with polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (dioxins) and polychlorinated dibenzofurans (furans).

EPA Region 6 is the lead agency for this Site. The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) is the support agency. TCEQ provides review and comments on documents received from the PRPs and concurrences on the selected remedy.

### **Background**

In the 1960s, McGinnes Industrial Management Corporation transported liquid and solid pulp and paper mill wastes by barge from the Champion Papers, Inc. paper mill in Pasadena, Texas, to impoundments located north of I-10, adjacent to the San Jacinto River, where the waste was stabilized and disposed. Champion Papers, Inc.'s business records indicate the paper mill produced pulp and paper using chlorine as a bleaching agent. The pulp bleaching process forms dioxins and furans as by-products. The northern impoundments were used for waste disposal from September 1965 to May 1966. Details regarding the southern impoundment are less well known; however, the impoundment was likely constructed sometime between 1962 and 1964 based on evidence of berms visible in historical photos. Sand mining also occurred in the vicinity of the Site.

### ***Early Investigations***

Between 1993 and 1995, the City of Houston conducted a toxicity study of the Houston Ship Channel that included the San Jacinto River. Sediment, fish, and crab samples collected near the Site indicated elevated dioxin and furan levels.

Between 2002 and 2004, TCEQ conducted a study of total maximum daily loads (TMDL) for dioxins and furans in the Houston Ship Channel. Sediment, fish, and crab samples indicated the presence of dioxin and furan contamination in the San Jacinto River surrounding the Site. In April 2005, the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department sent a letter notifying TCEQ of the existence of former waste pits in a sandbar in the San Jacinto River north of I-10. The letter included: 1) discussion of anecdotal evidence, that indicated the pits were likely used from the mid-1960's to mid-1970's for disposal of paper mill waste; 2) data collected during the Houston Ship Channel Toxicity Study and TMDL study, discussed in the paragraph above; 3) documentation of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) dredge and fill permits in the area; and 4) requested that TCEQ further investigate the Site.

A preliminary assessment and screening site inspection was conducted between 2005 and 2006 to determine if the Site was eligible for proposal to the National Priorities List. Sediment sample results indicated elevated concentrations of dioxin congeners. The former surface impoundments were identified as the source of hazardous substances at the Site. Following this assessment and inspection, the Site was added to the National Priorities List.

#### ***Unilateral Administrative Order for Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS)***

On 20 November 2009, the EPA issued a Unilateral Administrative Order (UAO) to International Paper Company and McGinnes Industrial Management Corporation. International Paper Company is the successor to Champion Papers, Inc. Champion Papers, Inc. had arranged for the disposal or treatment of materials containing hazardous substances that were disposed of at the Site. McGinnes Industrial Maintenance Corporation operated the waste disposal facility at the time of disposal of hazardous substances. The UAO directed International Paper Company and McGinnes Industrial Management Corporation to conduct a RI/FS in accordance with provisions of the order, CERCLA, the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan (NCP), and EPA guidance.

Between 2010 and 2013, site-specific data were collected for the remedial investigation (RI). The RI included the collection of paper mill waste, sediment, tissue (i.e., hardhead catfish, Gulf killifish, rangia clam, and blue crabs), soil, and groundwater samples for analyses including dioxins and furans, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) as Aroclors, metals, semivolatile organic compounds, volatile organic compounds, and pesticides. Physical data collected during the RI included: a bathymetric survey, current velocity, material, geotechnical, riverbed properties, sediment loading, erosion rates of cohesive sediment, and net sedimentation rates.

#### ***Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent for Removal Action***

On 11 May 2010, EPA filed the Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent for Removal Action, which was entered into voluntarily by the EPA, International Paper Company,

and McGinnes Industrial Management Corporation. The Administrative Settlement Agreement and Order on Consent for Removal Action provided for the performance of a removal action (Time Critical Removal Action [TCRA]).

The EPA Action Memorandum required that the TCRA stabilize the northern impoundments to withstand forces sustained by the river, including a cover design that considered storm events with a return period of 100 years, and prevent direct human and benthic organism contact with waste materials. Elements of the selected TCRA included construction of a perimeter fence on the uplands to prevent unauthorized access; placement of warning signs around the perimeter of the northern impoundments and on the perimeter fence; design and implementation of an operations, monitoring, and maintenance plan; and installation of an armored cap with the following items:

- A stabilizing geotextile underlayment over the northern impoundment eastern cell
- Treatment through solidification of a portion (6,000 cubic yards in the upper 3 feet over 1.2 acres) of the western cell
- An impervious geomembrane underlayment in the northern impoundment western cell
- A granular cover over the northwestern area of the northern impoundment western cell
- A granular cover above the geotextile and geomembrane in the northern impoundment western cell
- A granular cover above the geotextile in the northern impoundment eastern cell.

From December 2010 through July 2011, TCRA construction activities were completed at the Site.



General Area of the Time Critical Removal Action

*Modified from: Integral Consulting Inc. and Anchor OEA, LLC. 2013. Remedial Investigation Report, San Jacinto River Waste Pits Superfund Site. Prepared for: McGinnes Industrial Maintenance Corporation, International Paper Company, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6. May.*

The Operations, Monitoring, and Maintenance Plan identifies continuing obligations, including monitoring and maintenance, with respect to the TCRA. TCRA inspection events include: 1) visual inspection of the security fence, signage and the armored cap, 2) collection of topographic survey data for the portions of the armored cap that are located above the water surface, 3) collection of bathymetric survey data for the portions of the armored cap that are below the water surface, and 4) manual probing of armored cap thickness at areas identified by the topographic or bathymetry surveys as more than 6 inches lower in elevation than during the prior survey. Inspection and repair reports, as needed, are submitted to EPA. The

Operation, Monitoring, and Maintenance Plan has been modified because the regular previous inspections failed to identify deficiencies in the cap.

## **Public Participation Activities**

EPA in cooperation with elected officials, and state, county, and local agencies have been providing a steady program of community outreach and public participation for the Site since the Site was listed to the National Priorities List in 2008. EPA and the state first met with area agencies such as the Houston-Galveston Area Council to update plans for Site cleanup under the Superfund Program.

EPA and its partner agencies such as Harris County have provided a robust and comprehensive program of community involvement and public participation for the Site. They started with a Community Meeting in 2010 to brief the public regarding the Site and share information on the Superfund process, the next steps, and how the community could get involved in this very technical remediation. As a result of intensive community interest, the Site was deemed a Community Engagement Initiative Site by EPA Headquarters, which led to additional outreach planning such as informational meetings and mail outs to a large site mailing list.

Starting in late 2010, the EPA initiated a Community Advisory Group for the Site known as the Community Awareness Committee which began a series of quarterly meetings at the Harris County Attorney's Office. In 2012, the EPA provided a Technical Assistance Grant to the Galveston Bay Foundation to hire a technical advisor to provide assistance. And, a number of local internet websites are being utilized to keep area citizens updated on site events.

EPA has since provided a number of Community Meetings, Open Houses, Elected Officials briefings, media interviews, Public Notices, and fact sheets to inform the public and keep residents updated on all Site developments that affect cleanup actions.

## **Desk Statement (External)**

Today, EPA is releasing for public comment its proposal plan for the Preferred Remedy to cleanup of hazardous materials including dioxins and furans at the San Jacinto River Waste Pits Site in Harris County, Texas. The public comment period is for 60 days. EPA will hold a public meeting in Harris County to discuss the Preferred Remedy with community on October 6, 2016.

After careful review of all available information, EPA's Preferred Remedy proposes a \$102 million cleanup to remove an estimated 200,100 cubic yards of materials exceeding our public health-based cleanup levels, install institutional controls and monitor the natural recovery for the northern impoundment; and a \$9.9 million cleanup to remove an additional 50,000 cubic yards of materials for offsite disposal of hazardous materials from the southern impoundment. EPA's Preferred Remedy meets the federal regulatory requirements of the National Contingency Plan for cleanup of hazardous waste sites across the United States and is protective of public health and the environment. The Preferred Plan also considers the ever changing river bed changes of the San Jacinto River which encroach on the site and protection of important downstream resources including the Galveston Bay estuary. EPA has also released its Administrative Record which consists of technical documents used to support its Preferred Remedy. EPA is inviting the public to review and comment on the proposed Preferred Remedy over the next 60 days. EPA

will carefully consider public input prior to making a final decision on the cleanup of the San Jacinto River Waste Pits site.

**Overview:** The communication plan provides for prenotification, notification and post-notification monitoring of elected officials, primary stakeholders and media interested in this action immediately following the release of the Proposed Plan.

### **Topline Messages**

- EPA's Preferred Remedy is protective of public health and the environment.
- EPA's Preferred Remedy meets the federal requirement of the National Contingency Plan and considers conditions at the site.
- EPA is releasing the Proposed Plan for the clean up the San Jacinto Waste Pits Superfund Site to solicit public comment on the cleanup alternatives as part of EPA's public participation responsibilities.
- The comment period is for 60 days.
- A public meeting in Harris county is scheduled for Thursday, October 6, 2016.
- The proposed Preferred Remedy calls for
  - Full removal of materials exceeding cleanup levels, institutional controls, and monitored natural recovery for the northern impoundments and aquatic area
  - Removal and offsite disposal for the southern impoundment
- Dioxin and furan are persistent in the environment and pose a long-term threat to public health and the environment.
- Based on existing conditions at the site, EPA does not believe a remedy of capping in-place is protective due to inspection and maintenance needs over the next 50 years and the uncontrollable changes to river conditions.
- EPA will select a final remedy after the public comment period has ended and the comments have been reviewed and carefully considered. EPA may select a different alternative or a modified version of the Preferred Remedy based on new information or public comments.
- EPA is proposing the Preferred Remedy in order to prevent public health and environmental exposure to Site contaminants, including dioxins and furans, and PCBs.

### **Roll Out Schedule**

TRIGGER will be the approval /signature of the Proposed Plan

September 19, 2016 (**Monday**)

T – 24 hours Pre-notifications (general verbal notice)

TCEQ  
Congressional Delegation

September 20, 2016 (**Tuesday**)

T – 2 hrs Pre-Notification (general electronic notice/statement)  
Community Advisory Group  
Local Officials

T – 1 hr Pre-Notification (electronic notice) Embargoed Press Release  
TCEQ  
Congressional Delegation

T – 30 min Revised San Jacinto Webpage posted epa.gov  
EPA posts documents (Proposed Plan and Administrative Record) to  
public website epa.gov  
Notification (electronic notice)  
TCEQ  
Congressional Delegation

T – 10 min Pre-Notification – Embargoed Press Release  
Community Advisory Group  
Local Officials

T Press Release issued

T + 5 min Notification of document availability (electronic notice)  
Community Advisory Group  
Local Officials

T + 1 hr Press Availability (Media, invite dial-in only)

T + 1.5 hr Media monitoring for follow up actions

T + 1 hrs Social Media Posting

T + 1 day Public Notice placed in local newspaper for 60 day comment period &  
public meeting (Oct 6)  
Mail community flyer to mailing list

### Materials

Desk Statement  
Proposed Plan, Administrative Record  
Q&As  
Fact Sheet  
Press Release

### **Responding to press inquiries**

**Proactive press:** Press Release issued with the release of the Proposed Plan. Region 6 press officers will respond to questions from the media, seeking information from Superfund, as needed.

### **Anticipated Reaction**

**Press:** Local press will be interested in this plan

**State:** The State of Texas is our partner in this plan and is not expected to have any issues with it or make statements against it.

**Regulated Community:** The PRPs will not like the proposed plan and could challenge in court.

**Congress:** Congressional interest will be high particularly from Senator Cornyn and Congressmen Gene Green, Al Green, Randy Weber and Brian Babin. We currently have a control from Congressman Al Green urging removal, and quotes from Congressmen Babin, Poe and Olson also calling for removal.

**Environmental Orgs:** Environmental organizations will support the removal plan. Additionally, there is a Community Advisory Council of local community members which will also be in agreement with the Proposed Plan. Several members recently requested a meeting through the CIC regarding a report release by the ACOE.

### **Questions and Answers**

#### **I AM NERVOUS THAT THERE ARE NOT MANY MORE QUESTIONS THAN THE ONES I PRESENTED TO THE GROUP.**

**Q:     What year was the site listed on the NPL?**

**A:     March 2008**

**Q:     Why so long?**

**A:     After unsuccessful negotiations with the PRPs, the EPA issue a Unilateral Order (UAO) to the PRPs to conduct the RI/FS. , The PRPs prepared workplans for the RI/FS that required approval by the EPA and concurrence by the Texas Commission on**

Environmental Quality. While this process was ongoing, the PRPs signed an Administrative Order on Consent (AOC), with EPA, to conduct a Time Critical Removal Action starting in May 2010, to stabilize the northern waste impoundments and prevent releases of contaminated dioxin materials.

**Q: Why did the EPA take over the RI/FS for the site from the PRP?**

**A:** The EPA did not take over the RI/FS from the PRPs. The Corps of Engineers conducted additional studies and evaluations for the Feasibility Study (FS) that the EPA added to the FS report. To save time, the EPA decided to add that information to the FS report.

**Q: Why didn't the EPA wait on the data it ordered the PRP to collect?**

**A:** The data that the PRPs are currently collecting is data to determine if the TCRA cap is functioning as designed. This additional sampling resulted from weather events during the previous months that caused some damage to the northern impoundment.

**Q: What are the contaminants?**

**A:** Soil and sediment samples show elevated levels of dioxins and furans, and PCBs.

**Q: Is the current armored cap working? Is so, why change?**

**A:** Indications are that the armored cap is working. The cap was designed and constructed as a temporary cap to contain exposed waste materials and prevent releases to the San Jacinto River. The EPA is currently evaluating alternatives for a permanent remedy.

**Q: What is the EPA's proposed remedy?**

**A:** The EPA is proposing the full removal of materials exceeding cleanup levels, institutional controls and monitored natural recovery for the northern impoundments and aquatic area, and removal and offsite disposal for the southern impoundment.

**Q: Is the state of Texas in agreement with the EPA's preferred remedy?**

**A:** The state of Texas supports the EPA's preferred remedy and is our partner on this NPL site. WHAT DOCUMENTATION DO WE HAVE TO SHARE? The state, through the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, review and comment on documents prepared by the PRPs for the site. TCEQ will also review and provide comment on the Proposed Plan and the Record of Decision for the site.

**Q: Why was this remedy selected?**

**A:** The EPA has determined that the preferred remedy will be protective of human health and the environment and achieve substantial risk reduction by removing the most



contaminated materials. It will also reduce aquatic risks by removing the threat of waste released into the river and provides a greater long-term permanent solution.

**Q: Does the community have input into the decision, and could the EPA change the preferred remedy?**

**A:** The EPA will accept written comments on the Proposed Plan during the 60 day comment period, If requested in writing, EPA may extend the comment period. EPA will also hold a public meeting to inform residents of the proposed remedy and obtain comments on the Proposed Plan. The preferred remedy can change in response to public comment or new information.

HOW TO COMMENT BOTH IN WRITING AND ELECTONICALLY Donn provide web info

**Q: Will the EPA keep the community informed throughout the process?**

**A:** The EPA, will keep the community informed through community meetings, open houses, elected officials briefings, , public notices, fact sheets and by posting information and documents on the web page for the site.

**Q: Who requested the Corps of Engineers Report? Why?**

**A:** The EPA requested that the Corps evaluate the alternatives being considered for the site to provide an independent assessment. The community and Harris County supported having an independent review and analysis. The EPA has also used the Corps to evaluate the current cap and provide recommendations for repairing cap deficiencies.

THEY HAVE DONE SO BEFORE – SO WE SHOULD TALK ABOUT THAT ALSO

**Q: Who funded it?**

**A:** The EPA used funds from the PRPs to pay for the Corps' assistance. RAISES COST QUESTION

**Q: What does it say? Doesn't it say it is more dangerous to remove the materials and safer to cover them with a cap?**

**A:** The Corps conducted extensive modeling and evaluation of the removal and capping alternatives. Both alternatives will work and both have different degrees of uncertainties. INSUFFICIENT ANSWER The evaluations performed to address the permanence of the existing repaired Time Critical Removal Action (TCRA) cap with the proposed modifications outlined in the capping Alternative 3N showed that the cap is expected to be generally resistant to erosion except for very extreme hydrologic events, which could erode a sizable portion of the cap. Approximately 80 percent (12.5 acres) of the 15.7 acre TCRA cap incurred severe erosion during the simulated extreme

(hypothetical) storm. The armored cap is predicted to have long- term reliability from scour related processes except under very severe hydrologic and hydrodynamic events. It is recognized that the uncertainty associated with estimates of the effects of some of the potential failure mechanisms, e.g., propwash, stream instability, is very high. The evaluations performed to address the effectiveness of the existing repaired TCRA cap with the proposed modifications in the capping Alternative 3N showed that the cap is expected to be highly effective in controlling the flux of contaminants and reducing the exposure concentration of contaminants in the water column.

The effectiveness of removal activities rely on residuals management through either excavation in the dry or capping/covering/backfilling. Best construction practices as well as erosion control for residuals management are needed for removal alternatives to achieve the same level of long-term effectiveness as capping alternatives. The short-term impacts of remediation activities are primarily related to resuspension of sediment, erosion of residuals, and the concurrent release of contaminants. Enhancement of the TCRA cap under Alternative 3N would be expected to produce very little impacts. Full removal under Alternative 6N would be expected to significantly increase short-term exposures to contaminants. Excavating the Western Cell in the dry and containing the rest of the site in a sheet pile wall could significantly reduce the resuspension. Excavation of the Western Cell in the dry or within a sheet pile enclosure is critical for reducing short-term impacts.

**Q: Didn't the EPA's own Remedy Review Panel find a cap to be protective? Why is a different remedy being proposed?**

**A:** The National Remedy Review Board (NRRB) had concerns with both the capping and removal alternatives. The NRRB provides recommendations but does not make a recommendation on what remedy works best. The Board acknowledged draft work by USACE on constructing a cap to withstand future hurricanes and 500-year floods. However, the preferred remedy presented to the Board is removal and off-site disposal of all contaminated waste and soils/sediments above the risk based level determined to be protective for direct exposure (6N). This alternative has the expressed advantage of being more effective in the long term due to uncertainties associated with future storm events that are expected to be extreme, and greater community acceptance. The capping alternative (3N), however, is identified as being easier to implement, more protective in the short term, and is an order of magnitude less expensive than the removal alternative. The Board recommends that the Region further consider the consequences of future extreme storm events and flooding, as well as the viability of maintaining cap integrity over the long term. Future extreme weather events must be considered when selecting the preferred alternative. The Board recommends that the Region explain in the

decision documents the rationale for the risk management decision considering factors such as river conditions (stability, depositional, erosional), protectiveness and long-term effectiveness and permanence. Region 6 is proposing the removal alternative to address the highly toxic dioxin waste materials in the waste pits. This will offer a permanent solution to address the waste materials. The EPA Region 6, in consultation with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, makes the final decision on remedy selection. **INSUFFICIENT ANSWER**

**Q: Why is the EPA proposing to remove the material from the waste pit? Isn't removal more dangerous? If not, why?**

**A:** The removal of the source materials from the waste pits will result in the permanent removal of highly toxic waste materials from the waste pits. Removal is not necessary more dangerous if certain care is taken during removal activities to prevent releases of contaminated materials. Sheet pile walls would be construction around the waste pit areas where materials are being removed. The removal of waste materials will be conducted in phases to prevent accidental releases using Best Management Practices (BMPs). **The removal alternative would permanently remove highly toxic materials from the waste pits. The capping alternative does not provide a permanent solution to address the highly toxic waste materials. INSUFFICIENT ANSWER**

**Q: Why is this proposal called a cleanup by excavation, not a dredging project? What is the difference?**

**A:** Removal of the waste by excavation will prevent the release of contaminated sediment to the San Jacinto River. The difference in cleaning up the contaminated materials is that dredging can result in releases of contaminated sediment and re-suspension of contaminated materials to surface water. **INSUFFICIENT ANSWER**

**Q: What will the EPA do to protect and prevent materials from going offsite during removal?**

**A:** Removing the waste materials by excavation in dry conditions will prevent releases that typically occur during dredging operations. **INSUFFICIENT ANSWER**

**Q: What happens if there is an accidental release during the removal the Corps warns about? What about the Galveston Bay Estuary and wildlife?**

**A:** The cleanup workplans will include measures to address and quickly respond to accidental releases. Plans are to construction a sheet pile wall around the areas that are being excavated to remove contaminated materials in dry conditions and prevent releases to the San Jacinto River. The cleanup will be conducted in controlled phases that prevent and minimize the amount of waste that could be released if an accident occurs. **HOW DO WE PLAN TO CONTROL A RELEASE INTO A RIVER? ISN'T THIS GKM?**

**Q: Who will pay for the cleanup of a downstream release?**

**A:** It is expected that the PRPs will conduct the cleanup and they would be responsible for any costs should any releases occur. The EPA and TCEQ will provide oversight of all cleanup activities and review and comment on workplans to ensure that releases do not occur. THIS ISN'T GOING TO BE SEEN AS A POSITIVE

**Q: Is there an emergency plan for an accident or hurricane?**

**A:** Emergency plans will be in place to respond to accidents, hurricanes, and flooding events. **EPA has an emergency notification plan in place to notify local officials. NEED TO TALK ABOUT EPA DOWNSTREAM NOTIFICATION POLICY**

**Q: Does removal of the waste pits impact wetlands? Does the EPA have to get a 404 permit?**

**A:** Since the proposed cleanup will be conducted by excavation methods and not dredging, the 404(b) permit would not be applied to the Preferred Remedy. The EPA will consider 404(b) requirement during the cleanup.

**Q: Will the EPA create a wetlands mitigation for the damaged wetlands?**

**A:** The EPA does not anticipate that wetlands would be damaged that would require wetlands mitigation.

**Q: Does dioxin kill oysters? Are oysters safe to eat after exposure to dioxin?**

**A:** The oysters would have to be exposed to very high concentrations of dioxin. There are currently no ban on eating oysters from the San Jacinto River. .  
**INSUFFICIENT ANSWER**

**Q: Are there drinking water intakes at risk downstream?**

**A:** There are no drinking water intakes on the San Jacinto River downstream of the Superfund site. . **INSUFFICIENT ANSWER**

**Q: When will the removal start?**

**A:** There are many steps that follow the selection of the remedy before starting the removal activities. Steps include negotiations with the PRPs to conduct the remedial design and implement the remedial action, preparing remedial design, preparing the contract document, and selecting the cleanup contractor. This may take three to four years or longer to start field work.

**Q: How long will removal take?**

**A:** ONCE STARTED, The cleanup is expected to take about 16 months.

**Q: What will the EPA do with the excavated sediments?**

**A:** The contaminated waste materials will be disposed of at approved permitted facilities.  
EXPLAIN TYPES – LANDFILLS? NIMBY IS GOING TO COME UP

**Q: What are the next steps? Timing?**

**A:**  
THE NEXT steps that follow the selection of the remedy before starting the removal activities. Steps include negotiations with the PRPs to conduct the remedial design and implement the remedial action, preparing remedial design, preparing the contract document, and selecting the cleanup contractor. This may take three to four years or longer to start field work.

**Q: Will the site be reused after cleanup? Who will own it? Will it be cleaned up to residential standards? What is the cleanup standard?**

**A:** It is not expected that the northern impoundment area will be used in the future. Removal of the waste materials from the northern impoundment will result in removing the impoundment down to an elevation close to the bottom of the river. WHY? BECAUSE AFTER SPENDING \$100 M IT STILL ISN'T CLEAN?

The southern impoundment area is currently being used as a commercial barge facility and will continue to be used for commercial/industrial purposes. INDUSTRIAL USE

**Q: What if the potentially responsible parties disagree with the EPA's preferred remedy?**

**A:** They can challenge the EPA's preferred alternative and present information for another alternative. They can refuse to implement the remedy selected by EPA.

**Q: What if the PRPs don't agree to do the work? Do you sue them? How long does that take?**

**A:** The EPA would first negotiate with the PRPs and if no agreement is reached, the EPA would order the PRPs to conduct the cleanup and would be subject to penalties if they do not comply. The legal process can take several years.

**Q: Does the EPA have money set aside to start work without the PRPs?**

**A:** The EPA does not set aside cleanup money for Superfund sites. Funding is allocated on a yearly basis. This site is a priority site for EPA and funding would be requested specifically to this action since Region annual remedial action funding, other than Tar

Creek, is about \$7,000,000. . FOLLOW UP Q. WHAT IS REGION 6 ANNUAL BUDGET?

**Q: Once work begins, how long will it take?**

**A:** The actual cleanup is expected to take about 16 months.

**ATTACHMENT A:**

**Programmatic Contact Information:**

Gary Miller (SF) X8318  
Donn Walters (SF) X6483

**ATTACHMENT B:**

Notification Chart [Names/Email/Telephone Numbers]

Program Notifications:

<b>Recipient/Whom to Notify</b>	<b>Who will Notify (name and office)</b>	<b>Method of Delivery (mail, fax, e-mail, phone call etc.)</b>
Harris County Team, State Agencies, CAC members	6SF-V	
Harris County Attorney Vince Ryan	6SF-V	713-755-5101
Port of Houston Authority, Channelview Office	6SF-V	281-862-9282
San Jacinto River Coalition, Jackie Young jeyoung@texanstogether.org	6SF-V	281-414-3194

XA Notifications:

Elected officials, names and contact information

NAME	Email	Office	Notifications
Sen. John Cornyn	<a href="mailto:Stephen_tausend@cornyn.senate.gov">Stephen_tausend@cornyn.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Laura_atcheson@cornyn.senate.gov">Laura_atcheson@cornyn.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:David_james@cornyn.senate.gov">David_james@cornyn.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Collin_mclochlin@cornyn.senate.gov">Collin_mclochlin@cornyn.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Linda_bazaco@cornyn.senate.gov">Linda_bazaco@cornyn.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Ana_garcia@cornyn.senate.gov">Ana_garcia@cornyn.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Jay_guerrero@cornyn.senate.gov">Jay_guerrero@cornyn.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Brent_oden@cornyn.senate.gov">Brent_oden@cornyn.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Jonathan_huhn@cornyn.senate.gov">Jonathan_huhn@cornyn.senate.gov</a>	202-224-2934	Austin
Sen. Ted Cruz	<a href="mailto:Max_pappas@cruz.senate.gov">Max_pappas@cruz.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Thaddeus_woody@cruz.senate.gov">Thaddeus_woody@cruz.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Katharine_mcaden@cruz.senate.gov">Katharine_mcaden@cruz.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Jason_wright@cruz.senate.gov">Jason_wright@cruz.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Bruce_redden@cruz.senate.gov">Bruce_redden@cruz.senate.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Michael_koerner@cruz.senate.gov">Michael_koerner@cruz.senate.gov</a>	202-224-5922	Austin
Rep. Gene Green	<a href="mailto:Justin.ackley@mail.house.gov">Justin.ackley@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Sergio.espinosa@mail.house.gov">Sergio.espinosa@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Joe.reyna@mail.house.gov">Joe.reyna@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Marlene.clowers@mail.house.gov">Marlene.clowers@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Sophia.gutierrez@mail.house.gov">Sophia.gutierrez@mail.house.gov</a>	202-225-1688	Austin
Rep. Al Green	<a href="mailto:Gregg.orton@mail.house.gov">Gregg.orton@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Nicholas.johnson@mail.house.gov">Nicholas.johnson@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Kevin.dancy@mail.house.gov">Kevin.dancy@mail.house.gov</a>	202-225-7508	Austin
Rep. Brian Babin	<a href="mailto:Mary.moody@mail.house.gov">Mary.moody@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Stuart.burns@mail.house.gov">Stuart.burns@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Will.carter@mail.house.gov">Will.carter@mail.house.gov</a>	202-225-1555	Austin
Rep. Randy Weber	<a href="mailto:Artur.suchorzewski@mail.house.gov">Artur.suchorzewski@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Jeb.webb@mail.house.gov">Jeb.webb@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Blake.hopper@mail.house.gov">Blake.hopper@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Dan.buckley@mail.house.gov">Dan.buckley@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Janet.rizzo@mail.house.gov">Janet.rizzo@mail.house.gov</a>	202-225-2831	Austin
Rep. Ted Poe	<a href="mailto:Tim.tarpley@mail.house.gov">Tim.tarpley@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Kim.brode@mail.house.gov">Kim.brode@mail.house.gov</a>	202-225-6565	Austin
Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee	<a href="mailto:abiola.afolayan@mail.house.gov">abiola.afolayan@mail.house.gov</a>	202-225-3816	Austin
Rep. Pete Olson	<a href="mailto:Sarah.whiting@mail.house.gov">Sarah.whiting@mail.house.gov</a> <a href="mailto:Richard.england@mail.house.gov">Richard.england@mail.house.gov</a>	202-225-5951	Austin

NAME	Email	Office	Notifications
	<a href="mailto:Michael.richards@mail.house.gov">Michael.richards@mail.house.gov</a>		
State Senator Sylvia Garcia	<a href="mailto:Sylvia.garcia@senate.texas.gov">Sylvia.garcia@senate.texas.gov</a>	512-463-0106	Austin
Harris County Judge	Ed Emmett <a href="mailto:judge.emmett@cjo.hctx.net">judge.emmett@cjo.hctx.net</a>	713-755-4000	Carmen
Mayor of Baytown	Don Carlos <a href="mailto:mayor@baytown.org">mayor@baytown.org</a>	281-420-6550	Carmen

#### Environmental Organizations

Alliance for a Clean Texas	David Cortez	<a href="mailto:david.cortez@sierraclub.org">david.cortez@sierraclub.org</a>	512-477-1729
Citizens Environmental Coalition Educational Fund	Rachel Powers, Executive Director	<a href="mailto:rachel@cechouston.org">rachel@cechouston.org</a>	713-524- 4232
Citizens League for Environmental Action Now (CLEAN)	Vickie Wolff, Executive Director	<a href="mailto:vicki@vickiwolf.com">vicki@vickiwolf.com</a>	214-354-5977
Coastal Conservation Association		<a href="mailto:webmaster@ccatexas.org">webmaster@ccatexas.org</a>	713-626-4222
Environment Texas	Robert Ressler	<a href="mailto:robert@environmenttexas.org">robert@environmenttexas.org</a>	512-479-0388
Environmental Defense Fund (EDF): Texas Office	James Marston, Director of the Texas Regional Office	<a href="mailto:jmarston@edf.org">jmarston@edf.org</a>	512-478-5161
Environmental Integrity Project: Texas Office	Ian Levin	<a href="mailto:ilevin@environmentalintegrity.org">ilevin@environmentalintegrity.org</a>	512-637-9477
Galveston Bay Foundation	Bob Stokes, President	<a href="mailto:bstokes@galvbay.org">bstokes@galvbay.org</a>	281-332-3381
Galveston Baykeeper	Charlotte Wells	<a href="mailto:charlotte@galvestonbaykeeper.com">charlotte@galvestonbaykeeper.com</a>	281-455-9595



Houston-Galveston Area Council Clean Air Action	Shelley Whitworth, Air Quality Program Manager	<a href="mailto:shelley.whitworth@h-gac.com">shelley.whitworth@h-gac.com</a>	713-627-3200
Recreational Fishing Alliance	Jim Smarr, Chairman	<a href="mailto:jimsmarr@gmail.com">jimsmarr@gmail.com</a>	361-463-1558
Save Our Gulf	Renee Blanchard, Coordinator	<a href="mailto:rblanchard@waterkeeper.org">rblanchard@waterkeeper.org</a>	
Sierra Club: Houston Chapter	Jim Williams, Chair	<a href="mailto:ezz@pdq.net">ezz@pdq.net</a>	
Texans Together Education Fund	Charhonda Cox, Director	<a href="mailto:Charhonda.cox@texanstogogether.org">Charhonda.cox@texanstogogether.org</a>	713-782-8833
Texas Environmental Justice Advocacy Services (TEJAS)	Juan Parras, Director	<a href="mailto:parras.juan@gmail.com">parras.juan@gmail.com</a>	713-926-8895
Texas League of Conservation Voters	David Weinberg, Executive Director	<a href="mailto:dweinberg@tlcv.org">dweinberg@tlcv.org</a>	512-477-4424
Texas League of Women Voters	Susan Shelton, Executive Director	<a href="mailto:sshelton@lwvtexas.org">sshelton@lwvtexas.org</a>	512-472-1100
Texas Medical Association	Austin King, President	<a href="mailto:president@texmed.org">president@texmed.org</a>	512-370-1300
Texas Public Policy Foundation	Gib Burton, President	<a href="mailto:info@TexasPolicy.com">info@TexasPolicy.com</a>	512-472-2700

## REPORTERS

ADD:

CITY OF BAYTOWN CITY COUNCIL  
 CITY OF BAYTOWN PARK AND RECREATION BOARD  
 CITY OF HIGHLANDS  
 CITY OF MCNAIR  
 CITY OF LYNCHBURG  
 GALVESTON BAY ESTURARY PROGRAM  
 HARRIS COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE  
 INTERNATIONAL PAPER (PRP)  
 MCGINNIS MAINTENANCE CORPORATION (PRP)  
 WASTE MANAGEMENT OF TEXAS (PRP)

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF STATE HEALTH SERVICES  
US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
TEXAS PARKS AND WILDLIFE  
SAN JACINTO CITIZENS AGAINST POLLUTION [WWW.KEEPITCAPPED.ORG](http://WWW.KEEPITCAPPED.ORG)  
CITY OF GALVESTON